

**REMARKS**

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 5. The claim language is supported by, e.g., ¶¶ [0011] and [0047] of the as-filed specification. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9 are currently pending.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) JP 08-092752 to Ogisu et al. ("Ogisu") in view of JP 01-092377 to Harada et al. ("Harada"), JP 11-244360 to Hattori et al. ("Hattori"), and JP 55-145620 to Inoue ("Inoue").

Amended claims 1 and 5 recite, among other things, "irradiating a resin material with ultraviolet rays while said resin material is in contact with a first solution . . . , wherein the resin material irradiated by the ultraviolet rays while in contact with the first solution lacks a surface having prior roughening."

None of the cited references discloses or suggests the above-mentioned features recited in claims 1 and 5. For instance, as acknowledged in the Office Action, p. 3, lines 19-21, Ogisu at ¶¶ [0012]-[0015] instead discloses that in an etching process, fine recesses are formed, providing a "roughened surface that helps adsorb catalyst." Similarly, Harada at ¶ [0007], lines 16-20, discloses that "when ... ozone and resin rapidly react with each other in the presence of ultraviolet irradiation ... the surface of the resin loses smoothness, with the result that the surface of the resin is roughened." Harada at ¶¶ [0012]-[0013] further teaches that representative Examples 1-3 exhibit higher adhesive strength due to the anchor effect of the roughened surface, compared to conventional plating materials. In view of the above disclosures, Ogisu and Harada teach roughening a surface of a resin material to enhance adhesion. Moreover, neither Hattori nor Inoue discloses or suggests modifying Ogisu or Harada to involve irradiating

a resin material that lacks a surface having prior roughening. One of ordinary skill in the art, therefore, would not have had any legitimate reason to modify Ogisu or Harada to incorporate a resin material that lacks a surface having a prior roughening, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not have had any reasonable expectation of success in using a resin material that lacks prior surface roughening, as claimed.

For at least these reasons, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the cited references, viewed alone or in combination. Claims 1 and 5 are allowable over the alleged combination of the references.

Claim 9 depends from claim 5, and incorporates all of the features of amended claim 5. Claim 9 thus is allowable for reasons at least similar to those explained above for amended claim 5.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ogisu in view of Harada, Hattori, and Inoue, and further in view of JP 10-088361 to Asakura et al. ("Asakura").

Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 depend from claim 1 and claim 5 respectively, and incorporate all of the features of the respective claim from which they depend. Asakura does not remedy the above-mentioned deficiency in the combination of Ogisu, Harada, Hattori, and Inoue. Accordingly, claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 are allowable for reasons at least similar to those explained above for their respective base claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 5, 2010

By: /Anthony M. Gutowski/  
Anthony M. Gutowski  
Reg. No. 38,742  
(202) 408-4000